



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/688,694

10/17/2000

Christopher R Lefebvre

47004.000062

2049

21967

7590

06/30/2010

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

BOVEJA, NAMRATA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7 *Ex Parte* CHRISTOPHER R. LEFEBVRE,
8 CHRISTOPHER JAMES KONEN SR.,
9 MATTHEW JOSEPH KEANE,
and ELISSA BUDISCHAK
10

11 Appeal 2009-008215
12 Application 09/688,694
13 Technology Center 3600
14

15 Oral Hearing Held: June 8, 2010
16

17 Before HUBERT C. LORIN, BIBHU R. MOHANTY, and
18 CAROLYN D. THOMAS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

19 APPEARANCES:

20 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:
21

22 YISUN SONG, ESQUIRE
23 Hunton & Williams, LLP
24 Intellectual Property Department
25 1900 K Street, N.W.
26 Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing Tuesday, June 8, 2010,
2 commencing at 9:49 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600
3 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Deborah Courville, a Notary
4 Public.

5 THE USHER: Calendar No. 3, Appeal No. 2009-008215. Ms. Song?

6 JUDGE LORIN: Thank you very much.

7 MS. SONG: Thank you.

8 THE USHER: You're welcome.

9 JUDGE LORIN: Good morning, counsel. Could you state your name
10 and spell it for the court reporter, please?

11 MS. SONG: Sure. My name is Yisun Song, Y-i-s-u-n, S-o-n-g.

12 JUDGE LORIN: All right. Thank you. Okay, counsel. We've read
13 the record. We're familiar with it. When you're ready, you have 20 minutes.

14 MS. SONG: Thank you very much. Good morning. My name is
15 Yisun Song. I'm with the law firm of Hunton and Williams. I'm here today
16 on behalf of our client, JPMorgan Chase, to discuss the merits of this
17 pending application. I'd like to address a couple points today. I'll start with
18 a brief summary of the pending claims. I will address the 103 rejections and
19 the filing of the 101 rejections.

20 The pending claims are directed to a system and method for retaining
21 customer loyalty. The invention is used by a financial institution to provide
22 incentives to customers where the incentives are tailored to the customer's
23 needs and expectations while achieving profitability for the financial
24 institution.

25

26

1 In generating these tailor incentives for a particular customer, the
2 claimed invention relies on three factors: The call type, why the customer is
3 calling; two, the customer's segment, which represents the customer's history
4 and behavior; and, three, profitability for the financial institution. By
5 relying on the call type in generating incentives, the invention can identify
6 tailored incentives on the fly in real time in response to a specific customer
7 request.

8 This pending case has two independent claims. Claim 19 recites a
9 computer-implemented method, and Claim 29 recites a computer-
10 implemented system. Both claims recite receiving a request from a
11 customer, retrieving account data, identifying the request as a request type,
12 identifying the customer as a customer segment, and then identifying
13 incentives based on the three factors, including request type, customer
14 segment, and profitability factors. These incentives are then offered in
15 response to a request to terminate the relationship. Each of the steps are
16 performed in response to a customer request.

17 In addressing the claims, the Examiner relies on a combination of two
18 references, the McCausland patent and the Gasner article. The Examiner
19 alleges that McCausland shows each and every limitation except for one or
20 more incentives comprising a product or service offered by the financial
21 institution. The system of McCausland is directed to establishing rules for
22 predicting the likelihood of churn, where churn is defined as the deactivation
23 of an active customer in the cell phone industry.

24 As shown in Figure 4 of the McCausland patent, the churn history
25 process is performed on a slow, regular schedule, such as once a month
26

1 during off-peak hours, to revise the rules to predict the likelihood of churn
2 for customers. The process models historical churn factors. Two identify
3 churn rates. In other words, McCausland predicts the likelihood of churn for
4 customers in the cell phone industry.

5 In contrast, the claimed invention is responsive to a customer request,
6 where the request is to terminate a relationship with the provider. The
7 request is identified as a request type. This information, along with
8 customer segment and profitability factors, are then used to generate tailored
9 incentives for the requesting customer.

10 Turning to the claim language, McCausland fails to disclose
11 identifying the request as a request type and also fails to disclose that the
12 request is the request to terminate the relationship with the provider. The
13 Examiner relies on McCausland's discussion of defining potential customer
14 problem factors, where these factors are stored in a database. These factors
15 are data-item categories from the database that are likely to predict -- that are
16 likely to indicate a problem the customer is having. Table 2 shows potential
17 customer problem factors in the cell phone industry, and these are used to
18 score and to predict a likely potential problem.

19 The factors relied on by the Examiner do not represent a request type
20 and are not identified or selected in response to a customer request.
21 Moreover, the discussion of these factors relied on by the Examiner is in
22 connection with the proactive contact with the customer, in other words, an
23 embodiment where the customer does not make a request. Therefore, the
24 subscriber factors relied on by the Examiner are stored in a database and not
25
26

1 at all connected to receiving a request from the customer nor other factors
2 relevant in identifying the request as a request type.

3 McCausland is primarily directed to performing a churn history
4 process on a slow, regular schedule, such as once a month, during off-peak
5 hours. As this process is performed on a regularly scheduled interval,
6 without any customer initiative, a customer request is not received.
7 Moreover, the system of McCausland does not identify any request as a
8 request type for the purpose of generating customer incentives.

9 While McCausland does mention the reactive mode as an alternative
10 to the proactive mode --

11 (Phone rings)

12 JUDGE LORIN: Could you stop for a second, counsel?

13 MS. SONG: Sure.

14 JUDGE MOHANTY: All right. Sorry, counsel.

15 JUDGE LORIN: Sorry about that.

16 MS. SONG: That's no problem. No problem at all.

17 JUDGE LORIN: Go ahead and proceed.

18 MS. SONG: Thank you. While McCausland does mention the
19 reactive mode as an alternative to the proactive mode, it does not disclose an
20 additional step of identifying a request as a request type for the purpose of
21 generating tailored incentives. In fact, the only detailed discussion with
22 respect to this reactive mode is in Figure 7, where the user may elicit
23 identifying information from the caller. There is no discussion of
24 identifying the request in connection with generating customized incentives.

1 Turning again to the claim language, McCausland also fails to identify
2 one or more incentives based on the three factors: request type, customer
3 segment, and profitability factors. The incentives of McCausland fail to take
4 into consideration all of those three claimed factors.

5 In contrast, the Examiner relies on, one, the customer problem as
6 being a request type; two, vulnerability factors as being the customer
7 segment; and, three, customer worth as being the profitability factors.
8 However, this conclusion is flawed and unsupported by McCausland. The
9 offers or incentives on McCausland are only based on customer worth. In
10 the abstract, McCausland recites, "Pre-approved potential offers are
11 configured in response to customer worth." Also, in Figure 12, which
12 illustrates how customer offers are generated, you can see that the offers are
13 only derived from customer worth, in Block 194.

14 The customer problems, which are relied on by the Examiner as the
15 request type, are not used to generate offers. They're only described in
16 connection with actions. McCausland distinguishes between offers and
17 actions. Actions are not based on customer worth. Instead, they are
18 associated with customer problems. As shown in Figure 13 of McCausland,
19 customer actions are faced only on potential customer problems. And the
20 abstract further clarifies that pre-approved potential actions are configured in
21 response to specify potential customer problems. There is no connection
22 between customer problems and the offers that are generated in
23 McCausland.

24 Finally, vulnerability factors represent how likely a customer is to
25 churn. These vulnerability factors are not used in generating incentives.

26

1 McCausland only relies on customer worth for generating incentives. Also,
2 McCausland specifies that these offers are pre-approved. If the offers are
3 pre-approved, they are not generated in response to a request type made by a
4 customer request. According to the Federal Circuit in Net Money IN, the
5 reference has to describe the correct configuration in order to meet the
6 claims at issue. The Federal Circuit emphasized that the requirement that
7 the reference describe not only the elements of the claimed invention, but
8 also it describe those elements arranged as in the claim. The Examiner's
9 analysis has failed to meet that showing.

10 In sum, there is no disclosure in McCausland that indicates customer
11 incentives are based on all three claim factors: One, request type; two,
12 customer segment; and, three, profitability factors. At most, the incentives
13 in McCausland are only based on one factor, customer worth.

14 As recognized by the Office Action, McCausland does not meet each
15 and every claim limitation, and for those missing limitations, the Examiner
16 relies on the Gasner article. The purpose of the Gasner article is to discuss
17 how statistical modeling can lead to portfolio profit optimization. Just as in
18 McCausland, Gasner does not disclose receiving a customer request and
19 further identifying the request as a request type for the purpose of generating
20 tailored incentives to retain the customer.

21 The Office Action has failed to provide a proper motivation for
22 combining the two. The Office Action concludes that it would have been
23 obvious to make the modification to include providing products offered by a
24 financial institution if McCausland was implemented in that manner. The
25 Examiner's rationale is nothing more than conjecture and possibilities.

26

1 Under this type of reasoning, any two references could be combined. If the
2 Office were permitted to make such generalizations, almost every proposed
3 combination could be supported because any reference, regardless of its
4 teaching, can be applied in a different manner if it were applied in that
5 manner.

6 Moreover, the resulting combination still fails to address each and
7 every claimed limitation. Neither reference teaches identifying a request
8 type and using that request type, along with customer segment and
9 profitability factors, to generate incentives in response to a request to
10 terminate.

11 Finally, the claims are rejected under a 101 rejection. The claims,
12 together with the specification and the drawings, support the understanding
13 that the recited interface and the models are all tied to a computer. The
14 specification and Figure 1 provide such support. For example, on Page 7 of
15 the specification, the Applicant recites that "this architecture is exemplary
16 only, and the system of the present invention may be implemented in a
17 variety of different computer and network types." For example, Customer
18 Segment Module 114, Card Segment Module, Call Type Module and
19 Incentive Module may reside on a standalone computer with itself -- which,
20 itself, is operatively connected to databases.

21 Therefore, one skilled in the art would understand that the claims are
22 tied to a computer system. The term module, as defined by the specification,
23 refers to a component within a computer system. Claim 19 recites a
24 computer-implemented method, and Claim 29 recites a computer-
25 implemented system. Both claims recite a graphical user interface for
26

1 displaying account data, and both claims recite a series of modules that are
2 defined and described by the specification and the figures as being part of a
3 computer system.

4 JUDGE LORIN: Questions?

5 JUDGE MOHANTY: No questions.

6 JUDGE LORIN: Counsel, no further questions.

7 MS. SONG: Okay.

8 JUDGE LORIN: Thank you very much.

9 MS. SONG: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity.

10 Whereupon, the proceedings, at 10:02 a.m., were concluded.